



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,611	12/01/2000	Nivelet Bernard	T2147-906626	8008

7590 09/13/2002

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE P.C.
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
McLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,611

Applicant(s)

BERNARD, NIVELET

Examiner

Sam Rimell

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Claims 13-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

(1) The claims 13-30 include a method of analyzing and an analyzing means which is based on the description from page 6, lines 12-20 of the specification. From the specification, it is not clear what the analyzing means is actually analyzing, what is the result of the analysis and how is the result being used. While it is clear from the examples that some kind of analysis is being performed, the nature of the analysis is totally unknown.

(2) The claims 13-30 describe an interaction with a “nomenclature”, that appears to correspond to the “nomenclature of possible values” described with respect to page 6, lines 21-25. However, the disclosure at this point states that nomenclature derives from a means which encodes values, but the means which encodes values is described as using the nomenclature. This suggests that the nomenclature is used before it is actually even created. Thus, it is not understood how nomenclature is actually created and exactly how it is being used.

(3) The claims 31-34 describe means for analyzing queries and means for translating queries based on the description provided at page 7, lines 1-4. Based on the description, it is not clear what kind of an analysis is actually performed, what exactly is done with the analysis. It is also not clear how the query is actually being translated into vectors. The statement that the translation “takes into account authorized relations” is so generic as to be essentially meaningless.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13: Claim 13 includes two periods (line 9 and line 13). The phrase “in accordance with given authorized relations” is indefinite. The phrase “the nature of the predicates” is indefinite and lacks antecedent basis. The phrase “the relations to be implemented in the predicates” is indefinite and lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 14: The phrases “the values of the predicates” and “the nomenclature of possible values” each lack antecedent basis.

Claim 15: It is not clear whether the “data” corresponds to the “data tables” or refers to some other type of data.

Claim 16-18: In each claim, the phrase “takes into account” is indefinite. In each claim, the phrase “the type of query served” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 19-22: Each of claims 19-22 are confusing because they depend from claim 13 but include a substantially different preamble. Claim 13 is addressed to “a method of preconditioning one or more data tables” while claims 19-22 are addressed to “a method of searching records”.... “according claim 13”, “according to claim 14”, “according to claim 15”, “according to claim 16”. None of claims 13-16 are define a step of searching records, so the scope and meaning of claims 19-22 is confusing.

Claim 23: The phrases “the processing of the numeric values” and “the line number for each coincidence” each lack antecedent basis.

Claim 24: Claim 24 includes a period in the middle of the claim.

Art Unit: 2175

Claim 25-26: It is not clear what the word “it” in line 1 is referring to.

Claim 27: The phrase “the machine with vectorial capabilities” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 31: In line 6, the phrase “the base” lacks antecedent basis. In lines 9 and 10, the phrases “the values of the fields” and “the file” lack antecedent basis. In line 12, both of the phrases “the nature of the fields” and “the relations to be implemented” lack antecedent basis and are indefinite. In line 12, the phrase “the predicates” lacks antecedent basis. In line 15, the phrase “taking into account authorized relations” is indefinite. In line 15, the phrase “the constraints on the predicates” is indefinite and lacks antecedent basis. In lines 17-18, the phrases “the filtered query”, “the values to be found in the fields” and “the associated relations” each lack antecedent basis.

Claim 32: The phrase “the data searched for in the result” lacks antecedent basis.

The present claims are obviously informal and contain so many grounds of rejection under 35 USC 112 that no meaningful examination in view of the prior art can be made, given the current state of the claims.

A search of the prior art has been performed and the results of which are attached to this action.

This application is found to be obviously informal, and has been examined in accordance with the procedure set forth in MPEP 702.01.

Application/Control Number: 09/701,611
Art Unit: 2175

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (703) 306-5626.



Sam Rimell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2175